

Added

8/18/16

26 catalogued?

HOUSING AUTHORITY
CITY OF
NEWARK

ANNUAL REPORT

STATISTICAL DATA PERTAINING TO PUBLIC HOUSING

1967

TABLE INDEX

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>TABLE NO.</u>
CENSUS OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS.....	1
CENSUS OF ELDERLY FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN ELDERLY FAMILIES.	2
CENSUS OF BROKEN FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN BROKEN FAMILIES...	3
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE AND SEX.....	4
A CUMULATIVE PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE.....	5
FAMILY SIZE.....	6
DISTRIBUTION OF MINORS.....	7
PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION OF MINORS.....	8
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH WORKERS.....	9
CENSUS OF PRINCIPALLY WAGE SUPPORTED FAMILIES.....	10
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME.....	11
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY GROSS ANNUAL INCOME.....	12
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY MONTHLY RENT.....	13
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC WELFARE.....	14
MOVEOUTS AND NEW TENANTS.....	15
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE.....	16
CENSUS OF ALL FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE.....	17
CENSUS OF BROKEN AND ELDERLY FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE.....	18
INCOME BY FAMILY SIZE.....	19
RENT BY FAMILY SIZE.....	20
WELFARE BY FAMILY SIZE.....	21
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES PAYING UNION DUES.....	22
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES NEEDING LARGER AND SMALLER APARTMENTS.....	23
DISTRIBUTION OF OVERINCOME FAMILIES.....	24

A study published this year by the Urban Land Institute indicates that, based upon current demographic trends, by the year 2000, 60% of this nation's population of 311,000,000 will live in three super-metropolitan or megalopolitan-areas: California, Florida, and an area stretching from the East Coast to the Great Lakes. That such predictions are being taken seriously and being acted upon is evident by the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development by the Federal Government and a Department of Community Affairs by the state of New Jersey.

The city of Newark also is aware of and concerned about the future potential and problems of such urbanization. Mr. P. Bernard Nortman, head of the city's Office of Economic Opportunity, in May of 1967 released statistical information on a nine-county, 20 and 30 mile radius of Newark. The transportation facilities came in for high praise as providing vital accessibility both to other Jersey points and to the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels, and the Verrazano, Goethals, and George Washington bridges. The report estimated that on an average weekday, over 484,000 persons enter central Newark. This vocational in-migration makes Newark "the most commuted-to major city in the United States, in terms of percentage." This daytime population which is more than double its nighttime counterpart, is largely drawn from the 4.5 million persons within the 30-mile radius of Newark in the state of New Jersey. Newark's suburbs are among the highest income areas in the nation and the fourth most densely populated — exceeded only by metropolitan New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

A major endeavor of the Newark Housing Authority is to countermand the flight of its residents to the suburbs. In pursuance of this end, the Authority was instrumental in the development of such private housing facilities as the Colonnade Apartments, the Hallmark House, and the Cooperative High Park Gardens. Furthermore, the Housing Authority has been a prime mover in the creation of an educational-cultural-entertainment-health center in Newark, including the expanded campuses of Rutgers University and the Newark College of Engineering, the proposed New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, a projected Arena and Convention Center, with such other possibilities as an expansion of the Seton Hall University School of Law, the creation of an Essex County Community College, and a Newark Botanical Garden; as well as the hope of reclaiming what has been termed "potentially the most valuable undeveloped real estate on earth," — the Meadowlands.

Many of the above mentioned enterprises — in planning and implementation — predated the formulation by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development of "the desirability of balance in local renewal programs, e.g., programs directed toward eliminating blight and providing housing for all income levels, up-grading and modernizing commercial areas and providing for the civic and cultural life of the community."

The Authority, while fully recognizing the housing needs of the city, has long been concerned with the vitality of the entire urban organism. Decent housing cannot exist in a vacuum: employment opportunities, shopping emporiums, educational and cultural establishments, entertainment facilities and medical and health centers are integral parts of the Good Life. Without

providing these concomitant factors, decent housing per se, can not significantly change the life of the dwellers nor enrich the life of the city. An emphasis on the building of dwelling units while ignoring the health of the community is futile.

It is an understatement to say Newark is a metropolitan area. With its 23 square miles, Newark has the smallest land base of any of the major cities, and is the second most densely populated big city in the country with 17,710 persons per square mile. Even that is being generous when one considers that nearly a quarter of Newark consists of an airport, a seaport and the presently un-inhabitable "Meadows." In spite of its size Newark is a big city with all of the attendant big city problems.

To speak of the magnitude of a city's problem is to risk overlooking the relatively small tragedies of the individuals making up the city as a whole. We live in a society of mass culture, mass transit, mass production and massive social dislocations; we devote our attention to world peace, and landing a man on the moon; we are prisoners of the time clock, the punch card, computerized information, and our rapid technological change; is there still attention to be given to smaller, but more immediate concerns of urban life? The city itself has ceased to be a viable community, it is cut off from the bedroom suburbs, provides only work, occasional entertainment, and infrequent shopping facilities. Those residents remaining in the city are virtually dwellers of a social isolate.

The Newark Housing Authority has chosen to reverse this pattern in two separate manners. As the relocation and redevelopment agent for the city of Newark, it is seeking to make the city more attractive and to draw the ex-urbanite back into the metropolis; secondly, as the public housing authority, it is attempting to provide better homes and opportunities for those who remain through choice or default. In pursuance of the second goal, the Housing Authority of the City of Newark maintains 17 low-rent public housing projects which total 10,721 units, with an additional 2,000 units designated for the elderly currently under construction.

The continuing activities of the Authority are administered in accordance with section 703 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 which requires that in an urban renewal area proposed for predominantly residential reuse "a substantial number of the standard housing units provided must be for low and moderate income families and persons." This is in essence a prohibition against the indiscriminate building of luxury apartments on the razed site of low-income dwelling units. Even prior to this federal prohibition, the Newark Housing Authority was engaged in the building of low-rent public housing and in the encouragement of private developers to underwrite other low or middle-income housing in the wake of urban renewal demolition. The Authority's Relocation Division was another instrument displaying the social responsibility of a public agency.

Residents of Public Housing in Newark

Prospective tenants of Newark public housing may come to, or be referred to, the Tenant Selection Division where an application is taken, documents submitted, interviews held and financial and residency eligibility determined; special preference is given to urban relocates and to veterans. If determined to be eligible, the family is permitted to make a preference as to which project or projects they wish to live in, and then they await an opening in their requisite apartment size. If during residency, a family requires assistance, facilities are available through the Authority's Tenant Relations and Community Relations Divisions.

The rents which tenant families pay begin at a minimum monthly gross rent of \$32.00. The ratio of gross rent to annual income is 21.81% or \$1.00 rent per month for each \$55.00 or fraction thereof, of annual income after \$100.00 exemptions for each dependent minor other than the husband or wife. Special arrangements are made for families receiving 51% or more of their income from welfare agencies. In all cases, rents are based upon income not upon number of rooms required.

Looking at the statistical data of Newark's Public Housing population for the past three years it is evident that while the number of families has remained constant, the total number of individuals has been gradually but steadily decreasing (Table 1). The trend is further confirmed by noting average family size. In the past year, average family size has remained constant or declined in every project except for Stella Wright Homes; the result being a slight decline in the total all-project average family size, which is now 3.5 persons (Table 6). While the overall average is on the decline, the large families, those for whom decent private housing is virtually impossible to find, are still accommodated in public housing. The percentage of families of at least six persons shows a small degree of increase, whereas families of a lesser number show considerable decrease. The decline in average family size is partially explained by the significant increase in one-person families, and large decreases in two and four-person families. The largest increases in three and eight-person families were not sufficient to offset the decline (Table 17), thereby producing a shift to smaller families.

The age of the Authority's tenant population appears to be undergoing an interesting change. In the year 1967, the number of minors increased about the same amount as in the year 1966 (Table 7), whereas the number of elderly individuals decreased by 100 in 1967 and by 24 in 1966, although the number of elderly families increased in both years (Table 2). Children five years-of-age and less are on the decline — by 181 in 1966 and by 363 in 1967; young persons from six to twenty are increasing — by 140 in 1966 and by 395 in 1967. Adults 21 to 60, however, decreased in number by 253 in 1966 and by an additional 198 in 1967. Elderly persons, 60 and over, showed an increase of 14 in 1966, and a decrease of 24 in 1967 (Table 4). The population then appears to be skewed toward the school-age category. This phenomenon calls

for increased planning of the social environment: schools, playgrounds, health facilities, organized social activities. Encouragement to stay in school, tutorial programs and study halls, job training and referral for those who drop out are additional instruments for meeting the challenge presented by this population.

Although the historic reason for public housing is to provide "decent, safe and sanitary housing," the Authority is no longer naive enough to suppose that the physical removal of the family from a slum dwelling magically dispels all problems. One lives as one has been taught to live — or, often more accurately, one lives in a manner because of not being taught to live any differently. The Newark Housing Authority has come to view public housing as encompassing more than "bricks and mortar". Some of the tenant families are still economically, educationally, and culturally deprived; mere environmental manipulation does not change that. From the moment Tenant Selection involves itself with a family, the Housing Authority begins an education-in-living process which not only promotes better housekeeping, but seeks to actively engage individuals and families in the life of the community. Managers keep themselves aware of the project situation, and Community Relations and Tenant Relations workers acquaint themselves with the families, articulate the needs of residents, and formulate programs and activities to enrich their communal and individual lives.

The following is a brief survey of how the Newark Housing Authority, both through its own Community Relations and Social Services Division and in cooperation with previously existing social agencies, is attempting to provide for the needs of its tenants:

NJ 2-1 (Seth Boyden Court)

Senior Citizens Center
Golden Age Group

NJ 2-2 (Pennington Court)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Explorers
Girl Scouts
Senior Citizens Center
Golden Age Group

NJ 2-5 (Baxter Terrace)

Baby Keep Well Station
Dental Clinic
Pre-School Classroom
Tenant League
Golden Age Group

NJ 2-6 (Stephen Crane Village)

Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Board of Education Recreation Program
Senior Citizens Club

NJ 2-7 (John W. Hyatt Court)

Baby Keep Well Station
Dental Clinic
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Explorer
Recreation Program
Tenant League

NJ 2-9 (Roosevelt Homes)

Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Girl Scouts
Recreation Program
Tenant League
Senior Citizens Club

NJ 2-11 (Walsh Homes)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Girl Scouts
Recreation Program
Tenant League

NJ 2-13 (Columbus Homes)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Dental Clinic
Bd. of Ed. Recreation Program
Dancing Classes
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Explorers
Girl Scouts
Tenant League
Senior Citizens Center

NJ 2-8 (Felix Fuld Court)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Girl Scouts
Adult Education Program
Senior Citizens Club

NJ 2-10 (Kretchner Homes)

Baby Keep Well Station
Dental Clinic
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Girl Scouts
Recreation Program
Senior Citizens Club

NJ 2-12 (Hayes Homes)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Explorers
Girl Scouts
Boxing Club
Teen Club
Tenant League
Newsletter
Police Athletic League

NJ 2-14 (Bradley Court)

Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Girl Scouts
Recreation Program
Senior Citizens
Police Athletic League

NJ 2-15 (Stella Wright)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Dental Clinic
4-H Club
Boy Scouts
Boys Club
Adult Education Program
Tenant League
Senior Citizens Club
Police Athletic League

NJ 2-16 (Stephen Crane Elderly)

See NJ 2-6 for activities

NJ 2-17 (Kretchmer Elderly)

See NJ 2-10

NJ 2-18 (Hayes Homes Elderly)

See NJ 2-12

NJ 2-19 (Scudder Homes)

Baby Keep Well Station
Pre-School Classroom
Cub Scouts
Boy Scouts
Teen-age Club
4-H Club
Study Center
Job Center
Newark Volunteer Church Service
Tenant League
Newsletter
Senior Citizens Center
Friendly Neighborhood House

Broken Families and Elderly Families

For the purposes of the Housing Authority, a broken family is defined as a family which contains minors and only one caretaker adult; the second adult may be missing either through death or desertion, although a parent in the armed forces is not considered "missing." Those families who have experienced the loss of a bread-winner are the families who, of necessity, have to settle for less than that which "normal" families take for granted. In days past, those families became burdens on their relatives, or, failing that, became prime candidates for foster homes, religious charity, or a degrading dole. Today, however, public assistance and public housing ease the plight of such unfortunates by providing shelter and a minimal living allowance.

This year the Authority initiated a change in the recording of "broken families." Previously, elderly broken families were included in the computation but now the two categories are mutually exclusive. Since there was an increase of seven elderly families and a decrease of 100 persons in elderly families, it may be assumed that elderly families are getting smaller, and the primary way in which elderly families are reduced in size is through the loss of one of the marriage partners. With this, theoretically, major source of broken families eliminated one could expect a decrease in the number of broken families; on the contrary, however, 1967 data shows an increase of 19 families and 302 individuals above the combined totals of "Broken Families" for 1966 (Table 3). This points up the fact that broken families, as well as extremely large families, the kind of families for whom decent low-cost private housing is most difficult to find, still turn to their public housing authority for assistance: the average family size for broken families is 3.6; which is slightly larger than the overall average family. If the missing parent were in the home, the family average would be 1.1 person larger than the overall average (Table 6), indicating that it is the larger than average family which tends to break up.

This correlation of broken-family with large number of minors may be indicative of a possible cluster of social problems. It is in order to mitigate such situations that the housing authority recognized the social needs of its tenants and responded by creating the Community Relations and Social Services Division mentioned earlier.

In a further acknowledgement of its very important role in planning for the needs of the community, the housing authority is constructing 2,000 more units for the elderly of Newark.

The elderly family presents different problems from other tenants; they are older, more infirm, often less tolerant of the noise and confusion of youth, and with different expectations of the future. For the younger tenants, public housing may be a temporary way station on the road to the great American Dream of a home-of-their-own; for the elderly, public housing may be a final refuge from the hectic pace of urban life: a resting place which provides shelter, security and the opportunity for social interaction. Reflecting national patterns, the elderly tenant population ratio of women to men is approximately 2:1; the actual number of women over the age of sixty is 2,816, while the number of men in that same age group is 1,474. (Table 4).

Workers, Wages & Income

In spite of the country's much touted opportunity to succeed and the ever rising standard of living, there do exist persons and groups of persons who are affected but not benefitted. They are affected because they see the relatively opulent standard of living, and, since the advertising industry thrives on making luxuries appear necessities, they are all the more frustrated because they cannot fully satisfy their appetites on the biological need level, let alone the psychological want level.

Of the Authority's total tenant population approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ has a gross annual income of under \$2,000., and approximately $\frac{3}{5}$ earn under \$4,000. (Table 12). When it is remembered that the total includes Social Security and all other forms of relief, and that only slightly more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the families are principally wage supported (Table 10), even that figure needs to be read in depth. It is important to defend the welfare recipients against the all-too-common assumption that they are shiftless freeloaders. According to Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Special Assistant to President Johnson, of the 73 million Americans currently on welfare, only about 50,000 males may be "capable of being given job skills and training that will make them self-sufficient." Even this figure of salvageable males is contingent upon "every program public and private . . . (being) adequately staffed and efficiently run."

Average weekly earnings of production workers in New Jersey rose from \$116.62 in December of 1965, to \$119.94 in December of 1966; while in the Newark area they rose from \$115.93 to \$121.06 in the same period. This general increase in prosperity appears to only partially affect the Authority's population: whereas the percentage of tenants with a gross annual income of under \$2,000. and \$4,000. has decreased, a nearly 2% increase in welfare recipients (Table 13), and a small decline in percent of wage supported families (Table 11), thwarts the assumption that this theoretical prosperity is the product of increased self-sufficiency. The poor may begin life being poor because of their parents' poverty, but they remain poor lifelong because of their lack of marketable skills or the lack of an opportunity to utilize them. It is a self-perpetuating cycle: poor children live in poor neighborhoods where there are often inadequate schools; these children receive little or no support in their educational goals from parents and fail to respond fully to what learning facilities they are exposed to; grow up inadequately educated and competent to fill only the most menial and marginal of occupations, thus continuing their precarious economic subsistence.

During the past year, 1966, the number of families in Newark Public Housing with no workers grew by 144. This change varied from a decrease of 40 families in that category at Walsh Homes, to an increase of 75 families with no workers at Stella Wright Homes. This decline in bread-winners was reinforced by a loss of 99 families with one worker, and 33 families with two or more workers. (Table 9)

It is in an attempt to combat such a situation and to break the previously mentioned cycle of poverty that the Housing Authority of the City of Newark has initiated such projects as: the Housing Employment Learning Program (HELP), the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Painters' Apprenticeship Program and the Newark Housing Authority Maintenance Training Center. For the Authority is aware that skills mean money, which together, can lead to pride and responsibility, and individuals with these characteristics are increments to any population.

These programs are examples of what the Authority believes to be the soundest implementation of the expressed goals of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development:

1. The conservation and expansion of the housing supply for low and moderate income families.
2. The development of new employment opportunities.
3. The renewal of areas with critical and urgent needs.

The Affluent Society created a stir upon campuses and in literate discussion groups, but *The Other America* began a War on Poverty. That war is far from being won. Whether worthwhile or flashy governmental programs come or go, the Housing Authority is an institution uniquely qualified to profit from its experience and to provide its population with the necessities and the amenities of not only the Affluent Society, but the Great Society. With its population and facilities, the Housing Authority might well change that which is so often mislabeled a ghetto into a center of social renewal. The removal of blight, the rehabilitation of deteriorating areas, the provision of public housing, and the redevelopment of urban land augers well for the revitalization of our urban centers which heretofore have been prematurely written off as archaic.

TABLE INDEX

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>TABLE NO.</u>
CENSUS OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS.....	1
CENSUS OF ELDERLY FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN ELDERLY FAMILIES.	2
CENSUS OF BROKEN FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN BROKEN FAMILIES...	3
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE AND SEX.....	4
A CUMULATIVE PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE.....	5
FAMILY SIZE.....	6
DISTRIBUTION OF MINORS.....	7
PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION OF MINORS.....	8
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH WORKERS.....	9
CENSUS OF PRINCIPALLY WAGE SUPPORTED FAMILIES.....	10
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME.....	11
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY GROSS ANNUAL INCOME.....	12
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY MONTHLY RENT.....	13
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC WELFARE.....	14
MOVEOUTS AND NEW TENANTS.....	15
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE.....	16
CENSUS OF ALL FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE.....	17
CENSUS OF BROKEN AND ELDERLY FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE.....	18
INCOME BY FAMILY SIZE.....	19
RENT BY FAMILY SIZE.....	20
WELFARE BY FAMILY SIZE.....	21
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES PAYING UNION DUES.....	22
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES NEEDING LARGER AND SMALLER APARTMENTS.....	23
DISTRIBUTION OF OVERINCOME FAMILIES.....	24

TABLE 1
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS

N. J. PROJECT NAME	FAMILIES					PERSONS				
	Total	W	N-W	Pct. W	Pct. N-W	Total	W	N-W	Pct. W	Pct. N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	523	477	46	91.2	8.8	1192	1011	181	84.8	15.2
2-2 Pennington..	236	96	140	40.7	59.3	706	269	437	38.1	61.9
2-5 Baxter.....	562	96	466	17.1	82.9	1704	265	1439	15.6	84.4
2-6 S. Crane....	354	320	34	90.4	9.6	923	810	113	87.7	12.3
2-7 Hyatt.....	400	241	159	60.2	39.8	1348	719	629	53.3	46.7
2-8 Fuld.....	299	27	272	9.0	91.0	923	35	888	3.8	96.2
2-9 Roosevelt...	271	72	199	26.6	73.4	904	246	658	27.2	72.8
2-10 Kretschmer...	728	415	313	57.0	43.0	2829	1404	1425	49.6	50.4
2-11 Walsh.....	626	363	263	58.0	42.0	2697	1489	1208	55.2	44.8
2-12 Hayes.....	1442	29	1413	2.0	98.0	5296	65	5231	1.2	98.8
2-13 Columbus....	1476	1126	350	76.3	23.7	5552	4062	1490	73.2	26.8
2-14 Bradley.....	301	286	15	95.0	5.0	851	798	53	93.8	6.2
2-15 Wright.....	1176	13	1163	1.1	98.9	5278	58	5220	1.1	98.9
2-16 Crane E.....	196	191	5	97.4	2.6	274	264	10	96.3	3.7
2-17 Kretschmer E.	198	189	9	95.4	4.6	261	247	14	95.6	4.4
2-18 Hayes E.....	98	9	89	9.2	90.8	123	12	111	9.8	90.2
2-19 Scudder.....	1656	138	1518	8.3	91.7	6548	810	5738	12.4	87.6
Total.....	10542	4088	6454	38.8	61.2	37409	12564	24845	33.6	66.4

TABLE 2
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF ELDERLY FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN ELDERLY FAMILIES

N. J. PROJECT NAME	ELDERLY FAMILIES				PERSONS IN ELDERLY FAMILIES			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	Total	Pct.	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	324	61.9	321	3	476	39.9	471	5
2-2 Pennington..	83	35.1	42	41	117	16.6	55	62
2-5 Baxter.....	202	35.9	49	153	334	19.7	69	265
2-6 S. Crane....	147	41.5	141	6	261	28.3	247	14
2-7 Hyatt.....	135	33.7	116	19	223	16.5	170	53
2-8 Fuld.....	99	33.1	23	76	151	16.3	26	125
2-9 Roosevelt...	85	31.3	31	54	118	13.0	42	76
2-10 Kretchmer...	212	29.0	187	25	363	12.8	301	62
2-11 Walsh.....	132	21.0	108	24	252	9.3	205	47
2-12 Hayes.....	289	20.0	21	268	524	9.9	27	497
2-13 Columbus....	360	24.3	319	41	582	10.5	492	90
2-14 Bradley.....	149	49.5	146	3	267	31.4	261	6
2-15 Wright.....	246	20.9	6	240	503	9.5	6	497
2-16 Crane E.....	195	99.4	190	5	273	100.0	263	10
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	100.0	189	9	261	100.0	247	14
2-18 Hayes E.....	94	95.9	9	85	119	96.7	12	107
2-19 Scudder.....	495	29.8	20	475	858	13.1	48	810
Total.....	3445	32.6	1918	1527	5682	15.2	2942	2740

TABLE 3
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF BROKEN FAMILIES AND PERSONS IN BROKEN FAMILIES

N. J. PROJECT NAME	BROKEN FAMILIES				PERSONS IN BROKEN FAMILIES			
	Total	Pct.	W	N-W	Total	Pct.	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	39	7.4	26	13	114	9.6	75	39
2-2 Pennington..	55	23.3	11	44	133	18.8	39	94
2-5 Baxter.....	95	16.9	9	86	327	19.2	28	299
2-6 S. Crane....	50	14.1	43	7	126	13.6	108	18
2-7 Hyatt.....	83	20.7	33	50	271	20.1	105	166
2-8 Fuld.....	91	30.4	2	89	350	37.9	5	345
2-9 Roosevelt...	61	22.5	9	52	210	23.2	37	173
2-10 Kretchmer...	173	23.8	60	113	702	24.8	223	479
2-11 Walsh.....	153	24.4	67	86	623	23.1	265	358
2-12 Hayes.....	471	32.7	2	469	1685	31.8	11	1674
2-13 Columbus....	337	22.8	228	109	1220	22.0	838	382
2-14 Bradley.....	43	14.3	38	5	133	15.6	120	13
2-15 Wright.....	291	24.7	--	291	1114	21.1	--	1114
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	342	20.6	19	323	1280	19.5	96	1184
Total.....	2284	21.7	547	1737	8288	22.1	1950	6338

TABLE 4 (Page 1 of 2)
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE, SEX AND PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Under 5		5		6-11		12-15		16-18		19-20		21-29	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2-1 S. Boyden...	57	53	8	16	65	65	38	27	21	18	3	13	38	48
2-2 Pennington..	55	56	9	15	57	58	32	31	22	16	15	8	36	54
2-5 Baxter.....	92	109	26	22	125	127	74	65	45	58	26	25	79	116
2-6 S. Crane....	26	28	9	8	60	54	36	34	26	23	19	13	29	29
2-7 Hyatt.....	101	121	25	16	126	115	61	74	40	31	7	20	66	92
2-8 Fuld.....	70	59	19	9	73	75	32	59	32	31	13	12	31	56
2-9 Roosevelt...	70	87	14	16	96	81	35	44	16	18	7	12	29	59
2-10 Kretchmer...	239	241	49	48	254	285	146	151	85	87	39	39	122	162
2-11 Walsh.....	273	217	52	34	306	265	161	149	95	92	17	40	118	173
2-12 Hayes.....	424	463	82	92	520	474	291	275	182	193	72	88	235	351
2-13 Columbus....	514	506	100	106	576	507	260	269	138	125	44	53	268	405
2-14 Bradley....	24	18	2	11	51	51	44	45	32	38	12	17	22	16
2-15 Wright.....	456	458	118	110	638	637	260	270	131	142	37	72	210	340
2-16 Crane E....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	683	651	158	137	709	686	283	266	127	140	29	77	307	489
Total.....	3084	3067	671	640	3656	3480	1753	1759	993	1012	340	489	1591	2390

TABLE 4 (Page 2 of 2)
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE, SEX AND PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	30-39		40-49		50-59		60-61		62-71		Over 71		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
2-1 S. Boyden...	37	48	38	67	47	73	4	13	52	129	84	130	492	700
2-2 ' Pennington..	33	49	12	30	10	27	--	3	12	28	10	28	303	403
2-5 Baxter.....	71	105	55	102	49	89	12	15	38	82	31	66	723	981
2-6 S. Crane....	39	56	37	77	50	80	6	13	33	65	30	43	400	523
2-7 Hyatt.....	55	75	38	69	20	45	5	9	24	50	17	46	585	763
2-8 Fuld.....	29	62	24	57	14	44	8	10	18	45	15	26	378	545
2-9 Roosevelt...	53	66	24	39	13	32	6	4	15	34	13	21	391	513
2-10 Kretschmer...	114	163	80	118	44	67	6	14	40	95	65	76	1283	1546
2-11 Walsh.....	105	165	87	102	43	50	5	9	29	42	18	50	1309	1388
2-12 Hayes.....	201	390	130	258	78	144	11	29	51	119	49	94	2326	2970
2-13 Columbus....	263	353	153	211	82	143	15	29	64	129	99	140	2576	2976
2-14 Bradley.....	19	34	43	74	29	47	7	15	37	70	31	62	353	498
2-15 Wright.....	287	340	121	183	58	101	8	24	56	119	43	59	2423	2855
2-16 Crane E.....	1	--	3	1	2	11	1	4	33	86	56	74	98	176
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--	1	1	--	3	--	3	26	68	61	98	88	173
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	1	4	2	6	--	1	10	35	28	36	41	82
2-19 Scudder.....	282	383	155	205	69	145	12	30	99	231	81	115	2994	3554
Total.....	1589	2288	1002	1598	610	1107	106	225	637	1427	731	1164	16763	20646

TABLE 5
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
A CUMULATIVE PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION OF TENANTS BY AGE AND PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Percent of Population under:									
	5 Yrs	12 Yrs	16 Yrs	19 Yrs	21 Yrs	30 Yrs	40 Yrs	50 Yrs	62 Yrs	72 Yrs
2-1 S. Boyden...	9.0	21.9	27.4	30.7	32.0	39.2	46.3	55.1	66.6	81.8
2-2 Pennington..	15.7	35.4	44.3	49.7	53.1	65.7	77.3	83.2	88.8	94.5
2-5 Baxter.....	11.8	29.4	37.6	43.6	46.6	58.0	68.3	77.5	87.2	94.2
2-6 S. Crane....	6.0	20.1	27.7	33.0	36.5	42.8	53.1	65.4	81.6	92.2
2-7 Hyatt.....	16.5	37.4	47.4	52.7	54.7	66.4	76.0	83.9	88.7	95.2
2-8 Fuld.....	14.0	33.0	42.9	49.7	52.4	61.8	71.7	80.5	88.8	95.3
2-9 Roosevelt...	17.2	40.1	48.9	52.7	54.8	64.6	77.8	84.8	90.9	96.3
2-10 Kretchmer...	17.0	39.4	49.9	56.0	58.8	68.8	78.6	85.6	90.2	95.0
2-11 Walsh.....	18.2	42.6	54.1	61.0	63.1	73.9	83.9	90.9	94.8	97.4
2-12 Hayes.....	16.6	38.7	49.4	56.5	59.5	70.6	81.8	89.1	94.1	97.3
2-13 Columbus....	18.4	41.7	51.2	55.9	57.6	69.7	80.8	87.4	92.3	95.8
2-14 Bradley.....	5.0	18.5	28.9	37.1	40.5	45.0	51.2	64.9	76.4	89.0
2-15 Wright.....	17.3	45.8	55.8	61.0	63.1	73.5	85.4	91.2	94.8	98.1
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	.4	.4	.8	1.2	2.7	9.2	52.8
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	.8	3.0	39.3
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4.0	11.3	48.4
2-19 Scudder.....	20.3	46.1	54.5	58.6	60.2	72.4	82.5	88.0	91.9	96.9
Total.....	16.4	39.0	48.4	53.8	56.0	66.6	77.0	83.9	89.4	94.9

TABLE 6
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
FAMILY SIZE BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Average Number of Persons in a Family					Cumulative Pot. of All Families with:			
	All Families	White Families	Non-White Families	Elderly Families	Broken Families	At Least 8 Persons	At Least 6 Persons	At Least 4 Persons	At Least 2 Persons
2-1 S. Boyden...	2.3	2.1	3.9	1.5	2.9	.8	6.7	19.3	58.7
2-2 Pennington..	3.0	2.8	3.1	1.4	2.4	3.0	10.6	34.7	69.0
2-5 Baxter.....	3.0	2.8	3.1	1.6	3.4	2.3	10.5	35.4	74.7
2-6 S. Crane....	2.6	2.5	3.3	1.8	2.5	1.4	6.2	23.7	75.4
2-7 Hyatt.....	3.4	3.0	3.9	1.6	3.3	4.5	18.3	42.2	74.0
2-8 Fuld.....	3.1	1.3	3.3	1.5	3.8	3.7	12.4	36.1	71.2
2-9 Roosevelt...	3.3	3.4	3.3	1.4	3.4	3.7	17.3	42.4	74.2
2-10 Kretchmer...	3.9	3.4	4.5	1.7	4.0	6.6	25.0	50.5	84.4
2-11 Walsh.....	4.3	4.1	4.6	1.9	4.1	12.0	29.5	57.3	85.5
2-12 Hayes.....	3.7	2.2	3.7	1.8	3.6	5.3	17.5	48.3	86.7
2-13 Columbus....	3.8	3.6	4.2	1.6	3.6	8.0	20.7	47.8	84.5
2-14 Bradley.....	2.8	2.8	3.5	1.8	3.1	2.3	10.6	27.2	77.7
2-15 Wright.....	4.5	4.5	4.5	2.0	3.8	12.3	32.5	58.6	89.4
2-16 Crane E.....	1.4	1.4	2.0	1.4	--	--	--	--	38.8
2-17 Kretchmer E.	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.3	--	--	--	--	31.8
2-18 Hayes E.....	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3	--	--	--	--	25.5
2-19 Scudder.....	3.9	5.9	3.8	1.7	3.7	11.2	25.3	49.1	82.2
Total.....	3.5	3.1	3.8	1.6	3.6	6.8	19.5	43.3	78.5

TABLE 7
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF MINORS, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	ALL MINORS				MINORS IN BROKEN FAMILIES			
	Total	Pct. of All Persons	W	N-W	Total	Pct. of All Minors	W	N-W
2-1 S. Boyden...	379	31.8	278	101	71	18.7	47	24
2-2 Pennington...	365	51.7	129	236	140	38.3	33	107
2-5 Baxter.....	786	46.1	116	670	222	28.2	21	201
2-6 S. Crane....	339	36.7	284	55	68	20.0	57	11
2-7 Hyatt.....	724	53.7	357	367	181	25.0	68	113
2-8 Fuld.....	480	52.0	3	477	243	50.6	3	240
2-9 Roosevelt...	487	53.9	134	353	147	30.2	28	119
2-10 Kretchmer...	1629	57.6	719	910	514	31.5	158	356
2-11 Walsh.....	1670	61.9	881	789	465	27.8	196	269
2-12 Hayes.....	3030	57.2	23	3007	1167	38.5	8	1159
2-13 Columbus....	3118	56.7	2229	919	874	27.8	604	270
2-14 Bradley....	347	40.8	318	29	85	24.5	77	8
2-15 Wright.....	3267	61.9	37	3230	770	23.5	--	770
2-16 Crane E.....	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	3876	59.2	563	3313	917	23.6	81	836
Total.....	20528	54.9	6072	14456	5864	28.5	1381	4483

TABLE 8
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES WITH MINORS, BY PROJECT

Families with Minors

<u>N. J. PROJECT NAME</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
2-1 S. Boyden...	146	27.9
2-2 * Pennington..	144	61.0
2-5 Baxter.....	308	54.8
2-6 S. Crane....	156	44.1
2-7 Hyatt.....	247	61.7
2-8 Fuld.....	177	59.2
2-9 Roosevelt...	165	60.9
2-10 Kretschmer...	491	67.4
2-11 Walsh.....	476	76.0
2-12 Hayes.....	1085	75.2
2-13 Columbus....	1032	69.9
2-14 Bradley.....	132	43.8
2-15 Wright.....	923	78.6
2-16 Crane E.....	1	--
2-17 Kretschmer E.	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	1129	68.2
Total.....	6612	62.7

Families with:

<u>1 Minor</u>	<u>2 Minors</u>	<u>3 Minors</u>	<u>4 Minors</u>	<u>5+ Minors</u>	<u>Pct. 5+ Minors</u>
38	42	31	19	16	3.0
46	38	28	18	14	5.9
85	97	59	31	36	6.4
64	43	25	14	10	2.8
55	55	59	35	43	10.7
48	49	37	16	27	9.0
34	45	32	26	28	10.3
89	100	92	89	121	16.6
82	95	97	71	131	20.9
274	282	231	138	160	11.1
237	251	205	139	200	13.5
41	29	28	20	14	4.6
166	185	159	153	260	22.1
1	--	--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--	--	--
227	239	210	145	308	18.6
1487	1550	1293	914	1368	13.0

TABLE 9
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF FAMILIES WITH WORKERS BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Number of Families with:			Percent of Families with:		
	No Workers	1 Worker	2+ Workers	No Workers	1 Worker	2+ Workers
2-1 S. Boyden...	305	190	28	58.3	36.3	5.4
2-2 Pennington..	115	110	11	48.7	46.6	4.7
2-5 Baxter.....	199	307	56	35.4	54.6	10.0
2-6 S. Crane....	155	168	31	43.8	47.5	8.7
2-7 Hyatt.....	184	189	27	46.0	47.3	6.7
2-8 Fuld.....	130	148	21	43.5	49.5	7.0
2-9 Roosevelt...	118	143	10	43.5	52.8	3.7
2-10 Kretchmer...	300	391	38	41.2	53.6	5.2
2-11 Walsh.....	237	360	29	37.9	57.5	4.6
2-12 Hayes.....	524	803	115	36.3	55.7	8.0
2-13 Columbus....	669	758	49	45.3	51.4	3.3
2-14 Bradley.....	128	137	36	42.6	45.5	11.9
2-15 Wright.....	401	665	110	34.1	56.5	9.4
2-16 Crane E.....	174	21	1	88.8	10.7	.5
2-17 Kretchmer E.	165	31	2	83.3	15.7	1.0
2-18 Hayes E.....	74	24	--	75.5	24.5	--
2-19 Scudder.....	654	919	83	39.5	55.5	5.0
Total.....	4532	5364	647	43.0	50.9	6.1

TABLE 10
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF PRINCIPALLY WAGE SUPPORTED FAMILIES, BY PROJECT
(At least 51% of income derived from wages)

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Total			Percent		
	All Families	Elderly Families	Broken Families	All Families	Elderly Families	Broken Families
2-1 S. Boyden...	198	36	17	37.8	11.1	43.6
2-2 ' Pennington..	117	10	24	49.6	12.0	43.6
2-5 Baxter.....	346	37	44	61.6	18.4	46.3
2-6 S. Crane....	193	28	27	54.5	19.0	54.0
2-7 Hyatt.....	211	18	25	52.7	13.3	30.1
2-8 Fuld.....	157	18	42	52.5	18.3	46.1
2-9 Roosevelt...	145	11	26	53.5	12.9	42.6
2-10 Kretschmer...	407	14	80	55.9	6.6	46.2
2-11 Walsh.....	379	15	50	60.5	11.4	32.7
2-12 Hayes.....	868	42	203	60.2	14.5	43.1
2-13 Columbus....	776	33	89	52.6	9.2	26.4
2-14 Bradley.....	160	27	28	53.1	18.2	65.1
2-15 Wright.....	741	50	118	63.0	20.3	40.5
2-16 Crane E.....	17	16	--	8.8	8.2	--
2-17 Kretschmer E.	5	5	--	5.2	5.2	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	13	9	--	13.3	9.6	--
2-19 Scudder.....	929	74	150	56.1	14.9	43.8
Total.....	5662	443	923	53.7	12.9	40.4

TABLE 11
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	All Families			Elderly Families			Broken Families		
	Wages	Soc. Sec.	Relief	Wages	Soc. Sec.	Relief	Wages	Soc. Sec.	Relief
2-1 S. Boyden...	42.1	58.1	10.5	16.0	88.9	10.8	51.3	25.6	23.1
2-2 ' Pennington...	50.4	24.6	27.1	12.0	65.1	33.7	45.4	3.6	52.7
2-5 Baxter.....	64.5	31.0	19.2	31.7	76.2	29.2	50.5	12.6	40.0
2-6 S. Crane....	56.2	33.9	11.6	20.4	76.2	17.7	60.0	4.0	22.0
2-7 Hyatt.....	54.1	32.8	21.3	15.5	87.4	18.5	36.1	9.6	56.6
2-8 Fuld.....	55.1	30.4	22.4	23.2	77.8	29.4	53.8	13.2	37.4
2-9 Roosevelt...	56.0	26.2	31.7	20.0	72.9	50.6	39.3	6.5	49.2
2-10 Kretschmer...	57.8	30.5	19.5	13.7	86.3	11.3	52.6	17.9	47.4
2-11 Walsh.....	61.4	20.6	25.7	17.4	81.8	29.5	34.6	9.8	58.2
2-12 Hayes.....	61.5	19.5	29.7	19.0	69.5	43.2	50.7	12.3	51.2
2-13 Columbus....	54.2	22.4	26.8	12.2	78.3	23.9	29.7	8.9	60.2
2-14 Bradley.....	57.5	51.2	4.3	25.5	86.6	4.7	69.9	41.9	11.6
2-15 Wright.....	65.4	20.5	28.1	25.6	75.6	42.3	44.3	13.4	54.3
2-16 Crane E.....	14.8	92.9	2.0	10.8	93.3	2.0	--	--	--
2-17 Kretschmer E.	12.6	94.9	5.1	16.2	95.4	5.0	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	22.4	80.6	29.6	19.2	86.2	30.1	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	59.7	27.5	32.2	23.2	78.4	47.1	46.2	12.3	54.4
Total.....	56.3	30.5	24.2	19.0	81.1	26.3	44.9	12.4	50.9

TABLE 12
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY GROSS ANNUAL INCOME, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	All Families			Elderly Families			Broken Families		
	Pct. Under \$2,000	Pct. Under \$3,000	Pct. Under \$4,000	Pct. Under \$2,000	Pct. Under \$3,000	Pct. Under \$4,000	Pct. Under \$2,000	Pct. Under \$3,000	Pct. Under \$4,000
2-1 S. Boyden...	37.4	60.1	69.1	55.0	84.9	91.7	20.5	48.7	64.1
2-2 Pennington...	35.9	49.4	60.9	77.1	90.3	91.5	23.6	50.9	69.1
2-5 Baxter.....	24.7	41.2	54.5	57.9	77.2	86.1	11.6	42.1	60.0
2-6 S. Crane....	26.2	45.4	57.5	47.7	75.6	83.1	26.0	46.0	62.0
2-7 Hyatt.....	31.3	46.9	55.2	64.4	84.4	87.3	31.3	55.4	73.5
2-8 Fuld.....	31.9	49.0	61.8	68.7	85.9	90.9	15.4	37.4	62.6
2-9 Roosevelt...	31.4	47.6	55.7	81.1	91.7	92.9	13.1	55.7	73.8
2-10 Kretchmer...	22.8	37.8	56.8	63.7	85.9	95.3	10.4	31.8	63.0
2-11 Walsh.....	17.9	33.0	52.5	63.7	79.6	89.4	15.0	49.7	74.5
2-12 Hayes.....	20.9	37.0	52.9	64.7	82.0	90.0	17.4	43.9	66.7
2-13 Columbus....	27.1	45.6	63.7	74.2	89.5	95.6	24.9	62.9	80.1
2-14 Bradley.....	17.3	38.5	52.4	31.5	65.1	82.5	7.0	23.2	39.5
2-15 Wright.....	16.4	31.2	44.8	54.9	77.6	84.5	14.1	42.9	67.0
2-16 Crane E.....	19.9	81.6	92.3	19.9	81.9	92.2	—	—	—
2-17 Kretchmer E.	4.0	88.7	97.3	4.0	88.7	97.3	—	—	—
2-18 Hayes E.....	75.5	89.7	96.8	78.7	91.4	96.8	—	—	—
2-19 Scudder.....	24.2	39.0	55.1	64.7	81.9	89.3	14.6	45.9	70.5
Total.....	24.4	43.0	57.8	56.6	82.8	90.4	17.2	46.7	68.9

TABLE 13
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY MONTHLY RENT, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	All Families			Elderly Families			Broken Families		
	Pct. Under \$45.	Pct. Under \$60.	Pct. Under \$75.	Pct. Under \$45.	Pct. Under \$60.	Pct. Under \$75.	Pct. Under \$45.	Pct. Under \$60.	Pct. Under \$75.
2-1 S. Boyden...	49.9	65.2	71.1	76.8	90.4	93.5	30.8	56.4	71.8
2-2 ' Pennington..	39.4	52.5	69.5	85.5	91.6	95.2	16.4	45.4	70.9
2-5 Baxter.....	31.5	48.0	60.5	69.3	83.7	88.1	18.9	47.4	65.3
2-6 S. Crane....	34.7	52.5	64.1	62.6	82.3	87.7	28.0	50.0	70.0
2-7 Hyatt.....	35.2	48.7	62.7	74.8	84.4	89.6	20.5	53.0	83.1
2-8 Fuld.....	40.1	55.5	68.2	78.8	88.9	92.9	23.1	47.2	67.0
2-9 Roosevelt...	37.6	49.4	64.6	88.2	91.8	94.1	24.6	50.8	81.3
2-10 Kretchmer...	30.3	47.9	66.9	79.7	90.1	95.3	17.9	44.5	70.5
2-11 Walsh.....	22.4	40.2	62.8	71.2	84.1	90.1	19.6	48.5	80.4
2-12 Hayes.....	26.1	41.5	60.4	76.5	84.7	91.3	20.4	46.5	72.6
2-13 Columbus....	32.0	50.4	73.2	83.0	91.9	96.1	27.9	54.3	83.1
2-14 Bradley.....	28.6	44.5	59.1	48.3	70.5	85.2	13.9	32.5	53.5
2-15 Wright.....	21.2	35.1	54.4	69.9	80.1	87.0	16.5	45.0	70.8
2-16 Crane E.....	26.0	88.7	93.4	26.1	88.2	93.3	—	—	—
2-17 Kretchmer E.	43.4	93.4	97.5	43.4	92.9	96.5	—	—	—
2-18 Hayes E.....	82.6	92.8	99.0	87.2	94.7	98.9	—	—	—
2-19 Scudder.....	29.3	44.2	64.3	74.7	83.2	90.1	20.5	48.2	78.6
Total.....	31.0	48.2	65.6	70.3	86.3	91.9	21.0	48.1	74.8

TABLE 14
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES RECEIVING PUBLIC WELFARE, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Welfare Recipients		Type of Public Welfare					Welfare Rent*	
	Total	Pct.	OAA	ADC	AB	APTD	Other Relief	Total	Pct.
2-1 S. Boyden...	55	10.5	28	10	--	11	9	33	6.3
2-2 ' Pennington..	64	27.1	15	33	1	12	7	48	20.3
2-5 Baxter.....	106	18.9	43	39	3	11	13	61	10.9
2-6 S. Crane.....	41	11.6	10	10	3	15	5	24	6.8
2-7 Hyatt.....	85	21.2	9	48	1	5	25	58	14.5
2-8 Fuld.....	67	22.4	23	36	1	8	5	34	11.4
2-9 Roosevelt...	86	31.7	28	34	1	15	10	57	21.0
2-10 Kretchmer...	142	19.5	17	97	1	11	24	93	12.8
2-11 Walsh.....	160	25.5	24	98	1	14	31	119	19.0
2-12 Hayes.....	428	29.7	88	250	5	40	62	291	20.2
2-13 Columbus....	397	26.9	49	215	9	30	102	309	20.9
2-14 Bradley.....	13	4.3	6	5	--	--	2	6	2.0
2-15 Wright.....	331	28.1	69	184	4	33	58	212	18.0
2-16 Crane E.....	4	2.0	--	--	2	1	1	2	1.0
2-17 Kretchmer E.	10	5.0	7	--	1	2	--	10	5.0
2-18 Hayes E.....	29	29.6	29	--	--	--	--	16	16.3
2-19 Scudder.....	534	32.2	174	225	14	42	108	349	21.1
Total.....	2572	24.4	619	1284	47	250	462	1722	16.3

* At least 51% of income derived from Public Welfare

TABLE 15
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
MOVEOUTS AND NEW TENANTS, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	MOVEOUTS			NEW TENANTS BY SIZE OF APARTMENT RENTED					
	Total Dwelling Units	Moveouts in 1966	Turnover Percentage	New Tenants in 1966	1 Br.	2 Br's	3 Br's	4 Br's	5 Br's
2-1 S. Boyden...	530	54	10.2	56	16	21	19	--	--
2-2 ' Pennington..	236	34	14.4	34	11	22	1	--	--
2-5 Baxter.....	569	51	9.0	46	10	33	3	--	--
2-6 S. Crane....	354	31	8.7	27	10	14	3	--	--
2-7 Hyatt.....	402	47	11.7	44	8	25	11	--	--
2-8 Fuld.....	300	28	9.3	26	8	17	1	--	--
2-9 Roosevelt...	275	32	11.6	27	13	8	6	--	--
2-10 Kretchmer...	730	118	16.2	125	21	55	43	6	--
2-11 Walsh.....	630	116	18.4	115	16	66	29	4	--
2-12 Hayes.....	1458	185	12.7	188	19	163	4	1	1
2-13 Columbus....	1556	283	18.2	284	26	195	55	6	2
2-14 Bradley.....	301	23	7.6	20	6	13	1	--	--
2-15 Wright.....	1206	142	11.8	137	13	92	21	7	4
2-16 Crane E.....	198	9	4.5	8	6	2	--	--	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	198	18	9.1	12	11	1	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	98	13	13.3	7	7	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	1677	217	12.9	217	35	132	37	10	3
Total.....	10718	1401	13.1	1373	236	859	234	34	10

TABLE 16
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF FAMILIES BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE, BY PROJECT

Percent of Tenants Living in N.H.A. Projects at Least:

N. J. PROJECT NAME							Age of Project
	2 Years	5 Years	10 Years	15 Years	20 Years	25 Years	
2-1 S. Boyden...	87.6	64.2	38.8	21.4	16.6	12.6	27 yrs.
2-2 ' Pennington..	84.7	62.3	36.0	18.2	7.6	5.9	27 "
2-5 Baxter.....	89.7	70.3	38.3	26.2	18.9	15.1	26 "
2-6 S. Crane....	90.4	73.4	52.5	26.8	15.5	12.4	27 "
2-7 Ryatt.....	86.5	56.2	30.2	12.2	5.0	2.0	25 "
2-8 Fuld.....	90.3	70.9	45.8	25.7	13.4	11.4	25 "
2-9 Roosevelt...	88.6	59.4	25.8	5.5	2.9	--	21 "
2-10 Kretschmer...	80.3	52.5	23.3	--	--	--	14 "
2-11 Walsh.....	78.9	45.2	23.5	--	--	--	14 "
2-12 Hayes.....	85.8	58.2	29.5	--	--	--	13 "
2-13 Columbus....	80.5	48.8	23.0	--	--	--	11 "
2-14 Bradley.....	92.4	69.4	44.5	17.9	8.3	5.6	25 "
2-15 Wright.....	87.1	59.2	--	--	--	--	7 "
2-16 Crane E.....	94.4	78.1	--	--	--	--	5 "
2-17 Kretschmer E.	89.4	78.8	--	--	--	--	5 "
2-18 Hayes E.....	91.8	77.6	--	--	--	--	5 "
2-19 Scudder.....	86.0	--	--	--	--	--	4 "
Total.....							

TABLE 17
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF ALL FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE

Families Consisting of:

	Total	W	N-W	Pct. W	Pct. N-W
1 Person....	2262	1269	993	56.1	43.9
2 Persons...	2267	991	1276	43.7	56.3
3 Persons...	1442	437	1005	30.3	69.7
4 Persons...	1357	405	952	29.9	70.1
5 Persons...	1158	349	809	30.1	69.9
6 Persons...	807	260	547	32.2	67.8
7 Persons...	527	154	373	29.2	70.8
8 Persons...	333	114	219	34.2	65.8
9 Persons...	201	58	143	28.9	71.1
10+ Persons...	188	51	137	27.1	72.9

TABLE 10
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
CENSUS OF ALL BROKEN AND ALL ELDERLY FAMILIES BY FAMILY SIZE

Families Consisting of:

	All Families	Broken Families	Pct.
1 Person....	2262	--	--
2 Persons...	2267	635	28.0
3 Persons...	1442	646	44.8
4 Persons...	1357	444	32.7
5 Persons...	1158	273	23.6
6 Persons...	807	143	17.7
7 Persons...	527	60	11.4
8 Persons...	333	47	14.1
9 Persons...	201	23	11.4
10+ Persons...	188	13	6.9

	All Families	Elderly Families	Pct.
	2262	1952	86.3
	2267	1165	51.4
	1442	177	12.3
	1357	56	4.1
	1158	33	2.8
	807	24	3.0
	527	13	2.5
	333	12	3.6
	201	9	4.5
	188	4	2.1

TABLE 19
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
INCOME BY FAMILY SIZE

Families Consisting of:

	All Families	Pct. Under \$2000	Pct. Under \$3000	Pct. Under \$4000	Pct. Under \$5000	Pct. Under \$6000
1 Person....	2262	70.8	91.1	96.0	98.6	99.5
2 Persons...	2267	31.1	57.4	75.0	88.5	94.7
3 Persons...	1442	12.8	35.7	52.9	75.4	88.3
4 Persons...	1357	3.9	26.9	44.6	65.6	81.7
5 Persons...	1158	1.5	15.6	34.5	55.6	73.6
6 Persons...	807	.2	7.1	30.0	52.5	71.1
7 Persons...	523	.8	5.7	19.9	46.3	66.8
8 Persons...	333	--	3.0	16.5	44.4	66.7
9 Persons...	201	--	3.0	14.4	34.8	63.2
10+ Persons...	188	1.1	2.1	7.4	23.4	52.6

TABLE 20
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
RENT BY FAMILY SIZE

Families Consisting of:

	All Families	Pct. Under \$45.	Pct. Under \$60.	Pct. Under \$75.	Pct. Under \$90.
1 Person....	2262	81.6	94.1	97.2	98.9
2 Persons...	2267	45.0	67.7	81.6	91.3
3 Persons...	1442	11.8	46.7	65.7	80.0
4 Persons...	1357	7.8	21.1	56.7	73.9
5 Persons...	1158	5.4	16.5	47.8	66.7
6 Persons...	807	3.3	16.0	34.6	65.6
7 Persons...	527	4.0	12.7	30.2	50.7
8 Persons...	333	1.8	11.1	24.9	42.3
9 Persons...	201	2.5	11.9	21.9	41.3
10+ Persons...	188	1.1	7.4	20.2	37.2

TABLE #1
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
WELFARE RECIPIENTS BY FAMILY SIZE

Families Consisting of:

	All Families	Welfare Recipients	Pct.
1 Person....	2262	576	25.5
2 Persons...	2267	499	22.0
3 Persons...	1442	410	28.4
4 Persons...	1357	320	23.6
5 Persons...	1158	239	20.6
6 Persons...	807	164	20.3
7 Persons...	527	105	19.9
8 Persons...	333	106	31.8
9 Persons...	201	63	31.3
10+ Persons...	188	70	37.2

TABLE 22
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES PAYING UNION DUES, BY PROJECT

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Number				Pct.
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1967
2-1 S. Boyden...	61	64	79	75	14.3
2-2 Pennington..	63	60	59	53	22.4
2-5 Baxter.....	154	179	179	164	29.2
2-6 S. Crane....	61	57	61	57	16.1
2-7 Hyatt.....	95	107	108	101	25.2
2-8 Fuld.....	62	58	60	66	22.1
2-9 Roosevelt...	74	81	96	90	33.2
2-10 Kretchmer...	184	169	184	192	26.4
2-11 Walsh.....	171	171	212	187	29.9
2-12 Hayes.....	365	379	395	395	27.4
2-13 Columbus....	328	358	353	353	23.9
2-14 Bradley.....	54	60	54	50	16.6
2-15 Wright.....	329	356	401	409	34.8
2-16 Crane E.....	3	5	5	3	1.5
2-17 Kretchmer E.	9	5	6	5	2.5
2-18 Hayes E.....	3	5	4	3	3.1
2-19 Scudder.....	403	451	467	483	29.2
Total.....	2419	2565	2723	2686	25.5

TABLE 23
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES NEEDING LARGER AND SMALLER APARTMENTS, BY PROJECT

Requiring Larger or Smaller Apartments

Requirements by Number of Bedrooms (Br's)

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Requiring Larger or Smaller Apartments				Requirements by Number of Bedrooms (Br's)				
	Total	Pct.	Needs Larger	Needs Smaller	Needs 1 Br.	Needs 2 Br's	Needs 3 Br's	Needs 4 Br's	Needs 5 Br's
2-1 S. Boyden...	86	16.4	13	73	65	9	7	4	1
2-2 ' Pennington..	34	14.4	33	1	1	8	18	5	2
2-5 Baxter.....	41	7.3	21	20	18	4	14	3	2
2-6 S. Crane....	21	5.9	6	15	7	8	3	2	1
2-7 Hyatt.....	43	10.7	29	14	12	3	10	15	3
2-8 Fuld.....	64	21.4	35	29	26	3	18	16	1
2-9 Roosevelt...	19	7.0	16	3	2	6	3	6	2
2-10 Kretchmer...	102	14.0	28	74	61	10	12	11	8
2-11 Walsh.....	117	18.7	62	55	32	17	16	32	20
2-12 Hayes.....	158	10.9	110	48	43	7	70	32	6
2-13 Columbus....	220	14.9	48	172	151	10	39	19	1
2-14 Bradley.....	55	18.3	17	38	34	4	7	9	1
2-15 Wright.....	171	14.5	136	35	21	7	66	63	14
2-16 Crane E.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	2	2.0	--	2	2	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	216	13.0	179	37	23	14	89	55	35
Total.....	1349	12.8	733	616	498	110	372	272	97

Families needing 6 or 7 br's not included.
(188 families have 10 or more persons)

Department of Research, Information and Statistics - Feb. 28, 1967

TABLE 24
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF NEWARK
DISTRIBUTION OF OVERINCOME FAMILIES, BY PROJECT

Overincome Families

Income in Excess of Continued Occupancy Limits

N. J. PROJECT NAME	Overincome Families		Income in Excess of Continued Occupancy Limits				
	Total	Pct.	\$1 - \$499	\$500 - \$999	\$1000 - \$1499	\$1500 - \$1999	\$2000 +
2-1 S. Boyden...	58	11.1	14	12	10	5	17
2-2 Pennington...	11	4.7	3	--	1	4	3
2-5 Baxter.....	69	12.3	18	16	10	8	17
2-6 S. Crane....	48	13.6	11	9	6	5	17
2-7 Hyatt.....	36	9.0	8	8	5	6	9
2-8 Fuld.....	17	5.7	2	9	1	--	5
2-9 Roosevelt...	26	9.6	8	6	2	3	7
2-10 Kretchmer...	46	6.3	15	6	7	3	15
2-11 Walsh.....	24	3.8	8	6	4	4	2
2-12 Hayes.....	144	10.0	48	38	12	21	25
2-13 Columbus....	53	3.6	11	19	6	5	12
2-14 Bradley.....	68	22.6	16	12	7	5	28
2-15 Wright.....	103	8.8	21	29	17	13	23
2-16 Crane E.....	2	1.0	1	--	--	1	--
2-17 Kretchmer E.	1	.5	1	--	--	--	--
2-18 Hayes E.....	1	1.0	1	--	--	--	--
2-19 Scudder.....	76	4.6	21	15	14	9	17
Total.....	783	7.4	207	185	102	92	197